DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 138 FL 027 772

AUTHOR	White, Mary E.
TITLE	Evaluating the Bilingual Teacher: A Monolingual Administrator's Challenge.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	21p.; In: An Imperfect World: Resonance from the Nation's Violence. 2002 Monograph Series, Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the National Association of African American Studies, the National Association of Hispanic and Latino Studies, the National Association of Native American Studies, and the International Association of Asian Studies (Houston, TX, February 11-16, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrators; *Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *Evaluation Methods; Language Teachers; Teacher Competencies ; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Texas

ABSTRACT

This paper examines evaluation processes used to assess bilingual educators' teaching performance when monolingual administrators conduct the review, highlighting the importance of bilingual teachers in bilingual education programs. The four basic types of bilingual instruction include the following: English immersion, English as a Second Language (ESL), transitional bilingual education, and two-way bilingual education. Prior to teaching, bilingual teachers must pass a professional development exam, a bilingual comprehensive exam related to the grade taught, and the Texas Oral Proficiency Test. Although research indicates that capable teachers are the essential link between public aspirations for high quality schooling and student achievement, little has been done to prepare monolingual administrators to equitably evaluate these intensely trained bilingual teachers. Alternative evaluations are allowing teachers to take on a more active role in the evaluation process via portfolios, professional conversations, and student achievement. Data from an informal survey of bilingual Texas teachers indicates that the current evaluative tool does not adequately assess teaching abilities in Spanish. Teachers feel that monolingual administrators evaluating ESL programs obtain a limited view of the lesson overall. Suggestions include the following: use bilingual administrators for evaluations, add a bilingual component to the existing evaluation tool, and place bilingual administrators in schools with over 35 percent Hispanic students. A bilingual teacher evaluation form is included. (Contains 11 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 479 138

EVALUATING THE BILINGUAL TEACHER: A MONOLINGUAL ADMINISTRATOR'S CHALLENGE

MARY E. WHITE
TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
HOUSTON, TEXAS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kemuel Barry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL027772

Evaluating the Bilingual Teacher: A Monolingual Administrator's Challenge

"One of the most serious and explosive issues in the United States today is how to meet the educational needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students." (Bowman, 1994) Along with others, the National Urban Education Goals also include the challenge for equity in education for "at-risk" children.

As a Nation, we agree that more needs to be done to meet the instructional needs of our youth. However, one cannot leave out the social and cultural relation to how a student learns. Hand in hand with how a student learns is the curriculum being taught and, what I feel is most important, the teachers' involvement with that learning process. However, to give attention to the learning styles and needs of a student and not give any attention to the teacher who is developing those styles would be ludicrous, similar to driving a car without the steering wheel.

In the case of a bilingual student, this same scenario exists. The necessity of bilingual instruction is tantamount to that student's learning while retaining his native language and culture. To insure the success of the bilingual student, (the car), we include

the bilingual teacher, (the steering wheel). A certified bilingual teacher is the spoke around which the multi-faceted learning aspects of the bilingual child revolve.

Given the importance of a bilingual teacher in a bilingual program, I submit that the evaluation of this same teacher is equally as important. If after given a low evaluation score by an administrator; who is monolingual and therefore possibly, does not understand the cultural aspects or language exchange that is taking place during an evaluation, the bilingual teacher changes the linguistic approach to teaching a bilingual student in order to heighten her successive evaluations, what happens to the student? One cannot drive a motorcycle with an automobile steering wheel. While, although the evaluation goes better, it does not serve the ultimate purpose and that is reaching and teaching a bilingual child.

This paper will give attention to the evaluation processes that are used to assess bilingual educators' teaching performance when monolingual administrators conduct the review. Additional options must be explored to more adequately evaluate the quality of bilingual instruction in classrooms that serve non-English and limited English-speaking students.

The number of limited-English proficient children in the United States has increased dramatically over the past ten years. The debate over bilingual education centers on several key issues: such as culture and language maintenance, individual community, and national identity, and equitable access to social, economic, and educational opportunities. A review of research supports the notion that bilingual children do indeed display cognitive advantages when compared to monolinguals. (Lee 1996)

In 1962 a landmark study by Elizabeth Peal and Wallace Lambert (as cited in Lee, 1996), found that bilingual children scored significantly higher than monolinguals on most of the measures of verbal and nonverbal intelligence, in particular on those tests requiring mental manipulation and reorganization of visual symbols, concept formation, and symbolic flexibility. Thus Peal and Lambert's research suggests that there are cognitive advantages to being bilingual. Specifically, bilingual children appeared to be two to three years ahead of the monolinguals with regard to semantic development. In a study of low-SES (socio-economic status) Hispanic elementary school children enrolled in bilingual education programs, it was found that those children who displayed greater proficiencies in L1 (first language) and L2 (2nd

language) performed significantly better on measures of metalinguistic awareness and nonverbal intelligence Hakuta's study (as cited by Lee, 1996).

Cummins study (as cited by Lee, 1996) proposes that in order to avoid cognitive deficits associated with bilingualism, a critical level of proficiency in the native language must be attained, and a critical level of proficiency in L2 must be reached if advantages in cognitive functioning are to develop. In a major study conducted by Sandoval and Martinez (as cited by Lee, 1996) involving the evaluation of bilingual Head Start programs it was revealed that bilingual instruction was positively linked to enhanced cognitive language development, concept development, and perceptual motor development.

All of the above findings were a result of political influence on bilingual education. The Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 prohibits specific discriminatory conduct, including segregating students on the basis of race, color or national origin, and discrimination against faculty and staff. The EEOA also requires school districts to take action to overcome student's language barriers that impede equal participation in educational programs. This act while providing for equity in the quality of

instruction for all students, also allowed for the educational system in the United States to become highly decentralized.

The response of each state with respect to bilingual education or the treatment of its limited English speaking population is as diverse as the states themselves. In school districts with high concentrations of Latino students, major efforts have been launched to prepare teachers to more effectively serve these student populations. Some states such as California and Florida with a large Cuban and Hispanic American populace, have comprehensive programs to insure that "no child is left behind." Others emphasize the cultural aspect of learning by including in their teacher preparation program for bilingual teachers a 15-day intensive immersion program in Mexico. (Arribas, 1991) Additional efforts include the design of curricula, which will support students' transition from a bilingual into a regular classroom.

Varied perceptions of bilingual education were apparent in the September 18th issue of *Education Week*. It reported that, " Some use bilingual education to refer only to transitional bilingual education or two-way bilingual programs while others consider

any program designed for students with limited proficiency in English to be 'bilingual.'

Currently, there are four basic methodologies of bilingual instruction:

1. **English immersion**: Instruction is entirely in English. Teachers strive to deliver lessons in simplified English so that students learn English and academic subjects.

2. **English as a second language**: May be the same as immersion but also may include some support to individuals in their native tongue. Typically classes are comprised of students who speak many different languages but are not fluent in English. They may attend classes for only a period a day, to work strictly on English skills, or attend for a full day and focus both on academic and English.

3. **Transitional bilingual education**: Instruction for some subjects is in the student's native language but a certain amount of each day is spent on developing English skills. Classes are made up of students who share the same native language.

4. **Two-way bilingual education**: Instruction is given in two languages to students, usually in the same classroom, who may be dominant in one language or the other, with the goal of the students becoming proficient in both languages. Teachers usually team-teach, with each one responsible to teach in only one of the languages. This approach is also sometimes called dual-immersion or dual-language. (Unz, 2001)

In order for a bilingual teacher to teach in a bilingual classroom, he/she must pass the Professional Development exam, a Bilingual Elementary Comprehensive exam respective to the grade

taught (i.e., Pre-K – 4, or 4-8), and the Texas Oral Proficiency Test. Due to the critical shortage of teachers in the bilingual classrooms, some states are issuing emergency certification as well as providing alternative certification programs to meet the needs in these classrooms.

The November 2001 issue of National Association of Secondary School Principals, Leslie S. Kaplan, and William A. Owings confirmed through research that capable teachers are the essential link between public aspirations for high-quality schooling and student achievement. They submitted two broad areas to define teacher quality: teacher preparation/qualifications and teaching practices. They state, "Current research shows that student demographics are not the primary determinant of student achievement. Instead, a large body of inquiry confirms that what teachers know is the most important factor influencing what students learn." In a 50 state study they found that demographics, (poverty, minority status, language background) appear less influential than teacher quality variables, namely, holding full certification and a major degree in the field.

Despite the focus on the preparation of the bilingual teacher and the redesign of responsive curriculum, little has been done to

prepare monolingual administrators to conduct an equitable assessment of these intensely trained and prepared bilingual teachers. "For many years, educators have agreed that the fundamental purposes of teacher evaluation are both quality assurance and professional development." (Danielson, 2001) According to Foucault (as cited in Popkewitz, 1992) evaluation is a part of state regulation, monitoring and steering. Policy and policing are epistemologically related; policing, in its French and German origin, referring to the specific techniques by which government, in the framework of the state, enabled individuals to be useful to society.

Currently, I am awaiting further communication from Mr. Adel Safty who conducted research on the question of administration when French language immersion programs were integrated into English instruction schools in Canada. He argued that bilingual administration would be better than unilingual in fulfilling immersion teacher's needs, helping lessen conflict, and provide the leadership needed for program integration into the school culture. His study is currently the only one of its kind that has been located on the subject of monolingual administrators in a bilingual environment.

Recent trends in teacher evaluations include the differentiated approach, where reliance is placed on different activities, procedures, and timelines for different groups of teachers and multiyear cycles for tenured or career-track teachers. Traditionally, supervisors did evaluations on teachers. However, this approach is changing allowing teachers to take on a more active role in the evaluative process.

Among these types of evaluations are: portfolios, professional conversations, and student achievement. A good evaluation system should not only cultivate but also develop good teaching. The opposite effect takes place when we tie merit pay to evaluations. In this manner whatever is assessed is what is stressed in the classroom to the neglect of other areas. If ESL is what is evaluated, then this will be the focus for a teacher to the exclusion of enhancing the students' L1.

Consider for a moment if merit pay were attached to the skills of a medical doctor, or a professional athlete. Now, for every patient who expires we demote the pay of the doctor and for every game that was lost we demote the pay of the athlete, what would happen to these professions? In like manner to attach merit pay to student achievement is unfair. When a monolingual administrator

evaluates a bilingual teacher, the assessment is conducted in the ESL component of the program, which means that instruction is done in English.

In a bilingual classroom, if a student does not grasp a concept in English, usually it is explained again in the student's first language. Teaching the concept in the student's first language removes the communication barrier and supports learning. A monolingual administrator would miss the power of this kind of exchange in both teaching efficacy and language facility in instances where bilingual teachers are evaluated exclusively in English.

Most evaluations emphasize the development of children within each component. Once again, lets turn our attention to the ESL lesson, if three-fourths of the students are displaying an engagement in the learning process, and the other one fourth don't have a clue about what is taking place, in fact during the same evaluation, these NES students had become distracted and were now causing discipline concerns, in the eyes of the administrator has that teacher adequately performed her job?

Chapter 150, article #150.1003 of the Texas Commissioner's Rules Concerning Appraisal states the following:

> Each teacher must be appraised each school year. Whenever possible, an appraisal shall be based on the teacher's performance in fields and teaching assignments for which she is certified."

Nowhere within this ruling does it state that the evaluation "must" be on an ESL lesson. However a bilingual teacher with a monolingual administrator is evaluated on a monolingual lesson, no questions asked.

I conducted an informal ten-question survey of bilingual teachers in a district in Houston, (see appendix). Most of the respondents agreed that the current evaluative tool does not adequately assess teaching abilities in Spanish; they also agreed that a monolingual administrator evaluating an ESL lesson obtains a limited view of the lesson as a whole.

One of the bilingual teachers made an additional comment, which I felt, was insightful, "A teacher may do well in English before an administrator who only speaks English but not do well in Spanish instruction. The reverse may be true. The teacher may do an excellent job in Spanish but have poor English that needs more development. The second teacher, though excellent, may receive a poor rating while the first who needs help may receive an excellent, though undeserved, rating. Only an evaluator who

speaks and understands both languages can tell the difference between the one who needs language and one who needs improvement in teaching skills."

Another bilingual teacher of 31 years, who has experienced the development of evaluations, told of how she was given a poor evaluation based on her accent. She felt discriminated against because her accent was not an indication of her thinking or teaching skills. She also related an incident where she gave the same ESL lesson, with the same set of lesson plans, to the same group of students before two different administrators, one monolingual, the other bilingual. The bilingual evaluation was much higher. It was felt that the bilingual administrator had more of an understanding of the lesson and the students as well as the abilities of the bilingual teacher.

Even though it is felt that a monolingual administrator has some deficiencies with evaluating a bilingual teacher, I am not endorsing that the bilingual evaluation will always be higher. Evaluations also take on the personalities, personal issues, and challenges of the administrator. The same experienced bilingual teacher also related how a bilingual administrator because of some personality conflicts gave her a low evaluation.

The evaluation of a bilingual teacher by a monolingual administrator presents a special challenge, however it is a challenge that when addressed can cause the elevation in the professional development of the teacher and, the cognitive growth of the bilingual student.

The following are suggestions for meeting this challenge:

- Bilingual teachers are evaluated by bilingual administrators
- Add a bilingual component to existing evaluation tool
- Place a bilingual administrator in schools with a 35% or higher Hispanic American population

Bilingual teachers are evaluated by bilingual administrators; if a bilingual administrator is not available and the evaluation is completed by a monolingual administrator, allow the bilingual teacher a second evaluation by a bilingual administrator if the monolingual evaluation is unfavorable to the bilingual teacher. In this manner, the bilingual teacher is given the opportunity to receive a more equitable evaluation.

Add a bilingual component to existing evaluation tool: most evaluation tools have components which adequately reflect the skills of the teacher and the assessment of student learning, however they do not take into consideration the additional lesson

planning, instructional time, additional textbooks, and preparation that a bilingual teacher has to devote to his/her class.

Place a bilingual administrator in schools with a 35% or higher Hispanic American population: the availability of bilingual teachers is critical, however the availability of bilingual administrators is even graver. This is the reason for monolingual evaluations. However, there should be a greater emphasis placed on filling the administrator's position with a bilingual person when the school population represents a population of 35% or greater. This will not only enhance the teacher morale, but possibly the parental involvement as well.

These suggestions are not meant to be comprehensive but rather a springboard from which other schools of thought may evolve. It is felt that once more attention, research, and above all else input of bilingual teachers is considered a more egalitarian method of evaluating bilingual teachers will develop.

APPENDIX

Grade Level:_____ **BILINGUAL TEACHER EVALUATION SURVEY**
Tchng. Exp:_____

Please circle the number which best represents your beliefs:

(1) The PDAS accurately evaluates my teaching abilities in English:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	no opinion	agree	strongly agree

(2) The PDAS accurately evaluates my teaching abilities in Spanish:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	no opinion	agree	strongly agree

(3) My bilingual students show a greater benefit when the lesson is taught in both languages:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	no opinion	agree	strongly agree

(4) A bilingual administrator can give a more equitable evaluation:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	no opinion	agree	strongly agree

(5) The PDAS should be on a bilingual lesson:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	no opinion	agree	strongly agree

(6) A monolingual administrator evaluating an ESL lesson obtains a limited view of the whole lesson

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	no opinion	agree	strongly agree

(7) I gain a greater feedback on teaching abilities from a bilingual evaluation:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	no opinion	agree	strongly agree

(8) Adding an additional statement and/or section for the bilingual classroom to the PDAS would serve the best interest of the bilingual teacher:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	no opinion	agree	strongly agree

(9) I prefer to be evaluated by a bilingual administrator:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	no opinion	agree	strongly agree

(10) Bilingual teachers who do not perform well on a monolingual administrative evaluation should be allowed to have the second evaluation administered by a bilingual administrator:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	no opinion	agree	strongly agree

COMMENTS:

_____

_____

_____

References

Adel, Safty, (1992), "French Immersion: Bilingual Education and Unilingual Administration", (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No EJ463299).

Administration, Organization, and Financing of The Education System, (1995), *Progress of Education in the United States of America –1990 through 1994*, Department of Education.

Amaya, V., (2001), Personal Interview.

Arribas, Emilio, J., (1991) *Bilingual Teachers Take Part in Immersion Program in Mexico*, (Report NO. EJ428709), Journal of Educational issues of Language Minority Students, v8 p147-50.

Danielson, C., (2001), *New Trends in Teacher Education*, Educational Leadership, v58 p 12-15.

Hafner, J., (2001), Personal Interview.

Kaplan, Leslie, S., Owings, William A., (2001), "Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: Recommendations for Principals", *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, v85, [On Line].

Lee, Patrick, (1996), "Cognitive Development in Bilingual Children: A Case for Bilingual Instruction in Early Childhood Education", *The Bilingual Research Journal*, 20 (3 & 4), 499-522.

Lee, Patrick, (1996), "Cognitive Development in Bilingual Children: A Case for Bilingual Instruction in Early Childhood Education", *The Bilingual Research Journal*, 20 (3 & 4), 499-522.

Popkewitz, Thomas, S., (1992) "A Political/Sociological Critique of Teacher Education Reforms: Evaluation of the Relation of Power and Knowledge, *Proceedings of the Second*

National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues: Focus on Evaluation and Measurement, OBEMLA.

Unz, R., (2001), "Bilingual Education: *Education Week on the Web.*

FL027771

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE

I. Document Identification:

Title: An Imperfect World: Resonance from the Nation's Violence (2002 Monograph Series)

Editor: Lemuel Berry, Jr., Ph.D.

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: 2002

II. Reproduction Release:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please check one of the following three options and sign the release form.

_✓_ Level 1 - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.

____ Level 2A - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

____ Level 2B - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no option is marked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

Sign Here: "I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Lemuel Berry, Jr.

Position: Executive Director

Printed Name: Lemuel Berry, Jr.

Organization: NAAAS, NAHLS, NANAS, IAAS

Address: PO Box 325
Biddeford, ME 04005-0325

Telephone No: 207-~~282-1925~~ 839-8009

Date: 5/20/03